

From: Ramanauskas, Peter [ramanauskas.peter@epa.gov]
Sent: 8/26/2016 7:05:25 PM
To: Mullin, Michelle [Mullin.Michelle@epa.gov]; Moore, Kendall [moore.kendall@epa.gov]
CC: Peachey, Robert [peachey.robert@epa.gov]
Subject: RE: Sky Valley

Ex. 5 Deliberative Process (DP)

From: Mullin, Michelle
Sent: Friday, August 26, 2016 1:58 PM
To: Ramanauskas, Peter <ramanauskas.peter@epa.gov>; Moore, Kendall <moore.kendall@epa.gov>
Cc: Peachey, Robert <peachey.robert@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Sky Valley

OK, thanks Peter.

My biggest concern is that they seem to be defending a delay in schedule based on EPA direction to use a certain epoxy.

From: Ramanauskas, Peter
Sent: Friday, August 26, 2016 11:10 AM
To: Mullin, Michelle <Mullin.Michelle@epa.gov>; Moore, Kendall <moore.kendall@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Sky Valley

Hi Michelle,

I looked back through the emails I have. When you transmitted the PCB encapsulant research info to him back on 6/9, you stated that for best performance to control migration, "the no-solvent epoxy is recommended". Out of the list of epoxies tested by ORD, the Sikarard 62 was the only no-solvent one listed. He must have just taken that recommendation as an assumption that we would be OK with it's use. Other than that, I don't recall any approval of an encapsulation workplan. We wanted to see how successful they'd be with removing the caulk first.

That said, my thought is that it's probably not a big deal at this point since we'd still have to approve residual management in some way in the near future.

Kendall is out until Monday.

Have a good weekend!
Peter

From: Mullin, Michelle
Sent: Friday, August 26, 2016 12:10 PM
To: Moore, Kendall <moore.kendall@epa.gov>; Ramanauskas, Peter <ramanauskas.peter@epa.gov>
Subject: Sky Valley

Hi guys-

I was reading the status update that John Mannix sent out earlier this week. I noticed he states that confirmation sampling has been delayed due to complications in getting the epoxy that EPA approved.

“

Confirmation sampling has been slightly delayed due to the initial difficulty of obtaining the Sikarard 62 epoxy encapsulant approved by the U.S. EPA. It is only available from one distributor in California, and can only be shipped by freight due to the nature of its two chemical components.

I do not recall having a discussion with them about epoxy, other than to forward the epoxies that ORD researched. I don't think that can be construed as an "approval" in any way. I am guessing you also did not approve any epoxy. Certainly in our formal communications we never did.

Do you think we need to re-but this? Or just leave it be for now?

Michelle